



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,379	10/05/2004	Xaver Bachmeir	4100-353PUS	6221

7590 04/18/2006
Thomas C Pontani
Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane
551 Fifth Avenue
Suite 1210
New York, NY 10176

EXAMINER

HINZE, LEO T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/510,379

Applicant(s)

BACHMEIR ET AL.

Examiner

Leo T. Hinze

Art Unit

2854

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration..
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20041005.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2854

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The listing of references in the specification on p. 1, l. 10, p. 4, l. 30, and p. 5, l. 28, is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: "dampening rolls" in l. 2 lacks the proper antecedent basis because only "damping rolls" was previously recited..

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that

Art Unit: 2854

the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claims 12-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarda, US 4,889,051 (hereinafter Sarda) in view of Rendelmann et al., US 6,435,086 (hereinafter Rendelmann).

a. Regarding claim 12:

Sarda teaches an inking unit for a printing unit of a rotary printing press, said inking unit being removably receivable in the printing unit and comprising side walls, a plurality of rolls arranged between said side walls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4).

Sarda does not teach a dedicated drive mounted on at least one of said side walls of said inking unit for driving said plurality of rolls.

Rendelmann teaches a retractable inking/coating apparatus with a drive (62, Fig. 2) on one of the side walls. The drive is advantageous for driving the rollers synchronously with the plate cylinder (c. 6, ll. 58-59), and can be either a hydraulic or electric drive (c. 6, ll. 62-63).

Art Unit: 2854

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Sarda to include a dedicated drive mounted on at least one of said side walls of said inking unit for driving said plurality of rolls, because Rendelmann teaches that a dedicated drive is advantageous for driving the rollers synchronously with the plate cylinder.

b. Regarding claim 13, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches a damping unit (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4).

c. Regarding claim 14, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 13 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said damping unit comprises damping rolls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4) said dedicated drive is operatively arranged for driving said dampening rolls.

d. Regarding claim 15, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said plurality of rolls comprise one of distributor rolls and applicator rolls (c. 3, l. 67 - c. 4, l. 4).

e. Regarding claim 17, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. The combination would inherently result in an electrical interface for power, because the electric drive motor will require power to operate.

f. Regarding claim 18, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also inherently teaches interfaces for at least ink supply and dampening solution supply, because if the apparatus is to successfully operate as an inking unit and dampening unit, the device must have a supply of ink and dampening solution.

Art Unit: 2854

g. Regarding claim 19, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Rendelmann, as combined with Sarda in claim 12, also teaches a servo drive (c. 6, ll. 62-63).

h. Regarding claim 21, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above. Sarda also teaches an inking unit capable of being removed from the printing unit and operated in a further apparatus (Sarda is inherently operable in any GTO Heidelberg press, c. 1, ll. 39-40).

i. Regarding claim 22, the combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 21 above. Sarda also teaches wherein said inking unit is operable in the further apparatus that has compatible mechanical, fluid and electrical connections (Sarda is inherently operable in any GTO Heidelberg press, c. 1, ll. 39-40).

7. Claims 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sarda in view of Rendelmann as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Keller, US 5,794,531 (hereinafter Keller).

a. Regarding claim 16:

The combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

The combination of Sarda and Rendelmann does not teach guides and stops, said inking unit configured as a cassette that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops.

Art Unit: 2854

Keller teaches guides (432, Fig. 8) and stops (438, Fig. 7), said inking unit configured as a cassette (410, Fig. 7) that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops. This removable inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press (c. 2, ll. 58-60).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Sarda to include guides and stops, said inking unit configured as a cassette that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops as taught by Keller, because Keller teaches that such an inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press.

b. Regarding claim 20:

The combination of Sarda and Rendelmann teaches all that is claimed as discussed in the rejection of claim 12 above.

The combination of Sarda and Rendelmann does not teach wherein said inking unit is installable in and removable from the printing unit without tools.

Keller teaches guides (432, Fig. 8) and stops (438, Fig. 7), said inking unit configured as a cassette (410, Fig. 7) that is insertable into and removable from the printing unit by said guides and positionable in the printing unit using said stops. A latch (441) is used to secure the inking unit (c. 4, ll. 43-46) This removable inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press (c. 2, ll. 58-60).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify Sarda wherein said inking unit is installable in and removable from the

Art Unit: 2854

printing unit without tools as taught by Keller, because Keller teaches that such an inking unit is desirable because it allows easier access to the main cylinders of the printing press.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leo T. Hinze whose telephone number is (571) 272-2167. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Leo T. Hinze
Patent Examiner
AU 2854
13 April 2006


ANDREW H. HIRSHFELD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800